arXiv:1701.09148v1 [math.CO] 31 Jan 2017

Periods of iterations of mappings over finite fields with restricted preimage sizes

Rodrigo S. V. Martins*
Departamento Acadêmico de Matemática, UTFPR
Rua Marcílio Dias 635, 86812-460, Apucarana, PR, Brazil
rodrigomartins@utfpr.edu.br

Daniel Panario †
School of Mathematics and Statistics
Carleton University, Canada
1125 Colonel By Drive, Ottawa, ON K1S 5B6, Canada
daniel@math.carleton.ca

Claudio Qureshi‡
Institute of Mathematics, Statistics and Scientific Computing, UNICAMP
Rua Sérgio Buarque de Holanda 651, 13083-859, Campinas, SP, Brazil,
cqureshi@ime.unicamp.br

Eric Schmutz
Math Department, Drexel University
3141 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia 19104 United States
eschmutz@math.drexel.edu

February 1, 2017

Abstract

Let $[n] = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and let Ω_n be the set of all mappings from $[n]$ to itself. Let f be a random uniform element of Ω_n and let $\mathbf{T}(f)$ and $\mathbf{B}(f)$ denote, respectively, the least common multiple and the product of the length of the cycles of f. Harris proved in 1973 that $\log \mathbf{T}$ converges in distribution to a standard normal distribution and, in 2011, E. Schmutz obtained an asymptotic estimate on the logarithm of the expectation of $\mathbf{T}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ over all mappings on n nodes. We obtain analogous results for random uniform mappings on $n = kr$ nodes with preimage sizes restricted to a set of the form $\{0, k\}$, where $k = k(r) \geq 2$. This is motivated by the use of these classes of mappings as heuristic models for the statistics of polynomials of the form $x^k + a$ over the integers modulo p, with $p \equiv 1 \pmod{k}$. We also exhibit and discuss our numerical results on this heuristic.

1 Introduction

Let $f : [n] \to [n]$ be a function of a finite set to itself; such functions are called *mappings* in this work. The iterations of mappings has attracted interest in recent years due to applications in areas such as physics, biology, coding theory and cryptography. For instance, every polynomial f over a finite field $\mathbb{F}_p$ is a particular case of a mapping, and there are a number of applications where one considers the iterations of polynomials over finite fields. We highlight Pollard's classical factorization method for integers, which is based on iterations of quadratic polynomials; it allowed Brent and Pollard to obtain the previously unknown factorization of the eighth Fermat number. The adaptation of Pollard's method to the discrete logarithm problem also relies on iterations of mappings; it is considered by some authors the best attack on the elliptic curve version of this problem [24].

*Research supported by CAPES - Process number BEX 8267/13-8.
†Research partially funded by NSERC of Canada.
‡Research partially funded by FAPESP grants 2015/26420-1 and 2013/25977-7

In this work we focus on asymptotic results on the cycle structure of these dynamical systems. Let $f = f^{(0)}$ be a mapping on n elements and consider the sequence of functional compositions $f^{(m)} = f \circ f^{(m-1)}$, $m \geq 1$. Since there are finitely many mappings on n elements, there exists an integer T such that $f^{(m+T)} = f^{(m)}$ for all $m \geq n$. The least integer $T = \mathbf{T}(f)$ satisfying this condition equals the order of the permutation obtained by restricting the mapping f to its cyclic vertices. Erdös and Turán proved in [10] that the logarithm of the corresponding random variable defined over the symmetric group S_n converges in distribution to a standard normal distribution, when properly centered and normalized. By adapting Erdős and Turán's "statistical group theory approach" [10], Harris was able to prove that the normalized random variable $(\log \mathbf{T} - \mu_n^*)/\sigma_n^*$, where $\mu_n^* = \frac{1}{2}\log^2 \sqrt{n}$ and $\sigma_n^* = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\log^{3/2} \sqrt{n}$, defined over the space of mapping with uniform distribution, converges in distribution to a standard normal distribution [15]. The expected value of $\mathbf{T}$ was estimated in [22]:

$$\log \mathbb{E}_n(\mathbf{T}) = k_0 \sqrt[3]{\frac{n}{\log^2 n}}\big(1 + o(1)\big), \tag{1}$$

where k_0 is a constant determined explicitly that is approximately 3.36. The parameter $\mathbf{T}$ can be proven to be the least common multiple of the cycle lengths of the components of the functional graph of f. If $\mathbf{B}(f)$ is the product of all cycle lengths of f including multiplicities, then one might consider $\mathbf{B}$ as an approximation for $\mathbf{T}$. For instance, Proposition 1.2 of [22] implies that, for any $\delta > 0$, the sequence of random variables defined by

$$X_n = \frac{\log \mathbf{B} - \log \mathbf{T}}{\log^{1+\delta} n}, \quad n \geq 1,$$

converges in probability to zero. However, it is proved in [22] that the expectation of $\mathbf{B}$ deviates significantly from the expectation of $\mathbf{T}$:

$$\log \mathbb{E}_n(\mathbf{B}) = \frac{3}{2}\sqrt[3]{n}\big(1 + o(1)\big). \tag{2}$$

In this paper we derive similar results for the classes of $\{0, k\}$-mappings, $k \geq 2$, defined as mappings $f : [n] \to [n]$ such that $|f^{-1}(y)| \in \{0, k\}$ for all $y \in [n]$. We note that this is equivalent to restricting the indegrees of the functional graph of f to the set $\{0, k\}$. In [2, 18] the authors consider the case where k is a fixed integer. Although this case is arguably of the most interest due to connections with polynomials over finite fields, we derive our results in a more general context, as explained in Section 2, where k is allowed to approach infinity together with n. This might be desirable, for example, when modeling polynomials whose degree depends on the size of the prime p; see [8] for an example where this occurs. We obtain asymptotic estimates for the logarithm of the expected value of $\mathbf{T}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ over $\{0, k\}$-mappings on n nodes. We also prove an analogue of Harris' result [15] for $\{0, k\}$-mappings, that is, we prove that $\log \mathbf{T}$ converges in distribution to a standard normal distribution, when properly centered and normalized. An analogous result is obtained for the parameter $\mathbf{B}$.

By now there is a rather large literature on the asymptotic distribution of random variables defined on mappings with indegree restrictions. One motivation is methodological. Random mappings are important examples that serve as benchmarks for both probabilistic and analytic methods. On the analytic side, combinatorial methods can be used to identify generating functions whose coefficients are the quantities of interest. In many cases it is possible to estimate the coefficients asymptotically using complex analysis. A standard reference is [12], which includes several applications to random mappings. See also [11, 16]. In another direction, random mappings correspond to a large class of random graphs G_f for which the joint distribution of components sizes can be realized as independent random variables, conditioned on the number of vertices that the graph has. Stein's method of coupling has been used to prove strong and general results [3, 4]. One application of this theory is a generalization of the theorem of Harris [15] that was mentioned above. However the proofs in our paper are elementary, and do not directly use any of these probabilistic techniques (except indirectly by citing a theorem from [6]).

The research on random mappings with such restrictions is motivated also by the Brent-Pollard heuristic, where one uses these objects as a model for the statistics of polynomials. It was introduced by

Pollard in the analysis of his factorization method: he conjectured that quadratic polynomials modulo large primes behave like random mappings with respect to their average rho length [19]. However, the indegree distribution of a class of mappings impacts heavily the asymptotic distribution of a number of parameters [2]. Since it is known that the functional graph of a quadratic polynomial over $\mathbb{F}_p$ has just one node with indegree 1 and the remaining nodes are split in half between indegrees 0 or 2, $\{0, 2\}$-mappings could provide a better heuristic model for quadratic polynomials; see [18] for a discussion of alternative models for the Brent-Pollard heuristic. Furthermore, the class of $\{0, k\}$-mappings also provides a good heuristic model for polynomials of the form $x^k + a \in \mathbb{F}_p[x]$ with $p \equiv 1 \pmod{k}$. This heuristic model was used in [7] to predict that Pollard's method is sped up in some cases if these polynomials are used, eventually leading to the factorization of the eighth Fermat number.

The discussion in [18] suggests that unrestricted mappings and $\{0, 2\}$-mappings represent equally accurate models for the expected rho length of quadratic polynomials. This is the case because both classes of mappings present the same asymptotic average coalescence, defined as the variance of its distribution of indegrees under uniform distribution; see [2, 18]. It is curious that the knowledge of the indegree distribution of these polynomials does not represent an improvement on the heuristic. An asymptotic estimate on a different parameter, such as $\mathbf{B}$ and $\mathbf{T}$, represents thus an interesting problem: it could provide a significant deviation on the asymptotic behavior of these classes of mappings or reinforce the similarities between them. We exhibit our numerical results on the behavior of $\mathbf{T}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ over different classes of polynomials over finite fields and investigate different classes of mappings as heuristic models for the behavior of $\mathbf{T}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ over these classes of polynomials.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we establish notation and present the basic results that are needed for our main theorems; they concern mostly the distribution of the parameter that corresponds to the number of cyclic vertices of a mapping. In Section 3 we prove an asymptotic estimate for the expectation of $\mathbf{T}$ over $\{0, k\}$-mappings. Section 4 contains the analogous result for the parameter $\mathbf{B}$, whose proof is presented in the form of a sketch, since the arguments are very similar to the ones in the preceding section. In Section 5 we prove that the logarithm of both parameters $\mathbf{T}$ and $\mathbf{B}$, when properly centered and normalized, converge in distribution to a standard normal distribution; we also prove in this section that $\log \mathbf{B} - \log \mathbf{T}$, when properly normalized, converges in probability to zero. In Section 6 we present theoretical and numerical results concerning the use of classes of $\{0, k\}$-mappings as heuristic models for certain classes of polynomials.

2 Preliminary Results

For f a mapping, let $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Z}(f)$ be the set of cyclic nodes of f and let $\mathbf{Z} = |\mathcal{Z}|$. In the proof of our asymptotic results we make extensive use of the law of total probability, splitting the space of random uniform $\{0, k\}$-mappings according to the value that the random variable $\mathbf{Z}$ assumes. In this section we present and derive basic results concerning the distribution of this random variable over $\{0, k\}$-mappings. To avoid confusion, we index probabilities and expected values by the set of allowed indegrees of the class of mappings in question: $\mathbb{N}$ in the unrestricted case [22] or $\{0, k\}$ in our case. For example, the expected value of $\mathbf{T}$ over all mappings on n nodes is denoted by $\mathbb{E}_n^{\mathbb{N}}(\mathbf{T})$, whereas $\mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{T})$ denotes the expectation of $\mathbf{T}$ over $\{0, k\}$-mappings on n nodes.

The following theorem gives an exact result on the distribution of $\mathbf{Z}$ over $\{0, k\}$-mappings [21]. We note that a $\{0, k\}$-mapping f of size n satisfies $n = kr$, where $r \geq 1$ denotes the cardinality of the range of f. Also, the coalescence of f, defined as the variance of its distribution of indegrees under uniform distribution, satisfies

$$\lambda = \lambda(f) = \sum_{y \in [n]} \frac{|f^{(-1)}(y)|^2}{n} - 1 = r\frac{k^2}{n} - 1 = k - 1.$$

Theorem 1 (Equation (3.17) of [21]). *Let $n = kr$, $\lambda = k - 1 \geq 1$ and $1 \leq m \leq r$. A random uniform*

$\{0,k\}$-*mapping on* n *nodes has exactly* m *cyclic nodes with probability*

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z}=m)=\lambda k^{m-1}\binom{r-1}{m-1}\binom{n-1}{m}^{-1}.$$

It is possible to extend the quantity above to real numbers using the Gamma function $\Gamma(\cdot)$, since $n!=\Gamma(n+1)$ for any integer $n\geq 1$ (see Chapter 6 of [1]):

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z}=m)=\lambda m k^{m-1}\frac{\Gamma(r)}{\Gamma(r-m+1)}\frac{\Gamma(n-m)}{\Gamma(n)}. \tag{3}$$

We abuse notation when we write $\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z}=m)$ for non integer values of m, assuming this as the quantity given by Equation (3) instead of the probability of $\mathbf{Z}$ be equal to m (which is equal to zero).

In this work we consider $\{0,k\}$-mappings on $n=kr$ elements, where r denotes the size of their range and $k=k(r)$ is a sequence of integers satisfying $k\geq 2$ for all $r\geq 1$. Although $n(r)$ and $k(r)$ are functions of r, we omit this dependence on our notation and write simply n and k. We emphasize that *all asymptotic calculations and results in this work are taken as* r *approaches infinity*, unless said otherwise. We assume throughout the paper that, for some $0<\alpha<1$, $k=o(n^{1-\alpha})$ as r approaches infinity, or equivalently, $\log n=O(\log(n/\lambda))$ where $\lambda=k-1$.

Lemma 1 below combines well known facts about the Gamma function $\Gamma(z)$ and the Digamma function $\Psi(z)=\frac{d}{dz}\log\Gamma(z)$ (see Chapter 6 of [1]). Lemma 2 is a simple consequence of Lemma 1 and is used in the calculations of Sections 3 and 4, so we state here for future reference.

Lemma 1. *(Chapter 6 of [1]) The Gamma function satisfies*

$$\log\Gamma(y)=y\log y-y-\frac{1}{2}\log y+\frac{1}{2}\log(2\pi)+o(1),$$

as y *approaches infinity. Moreover, let* $\Psi(z)$ *be the derivative of* $\log\Gamma(z)$*. Then, as* y *approaches infinity,*

$$\Psi(y)=\log y+O\left(\frac{1}{y}\right)\quad \textit{and}\quad \Psi'(x)=\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{(x+k)^2}.$$

Lemma 2. *Let* $\Psi(z)$ *be the derivative of* $\log\Gamma(z)$ *and let* n,k,r *be integers such that* $n=kr$*. If* $x=o(r)$ *then, as* r *approaches infinity,*

(i) $\Psi(n-x)=\log n-\dfrac{x}{n}+O\left(\dfrac{x^2}{n^2}\right)+O\left(\dfrac{1}{n}\right),$

(ii) $\Psi(r-x)=\log r-\dfrac{x}{r}+O\left(\dfrac{x^2}{r^2}\right)+O\left(\dfrac{1}{r}\right),$

(iii) $\log\Gamma(n-x)-\log\Gamma(n)=-x\log n+\dfrac{x^2}{2n}+O\left(\dfrac{x^3}{n^2}\right)+o(1),$

(iv) $\log\Gamma(r)-\log\Gamma(r-x+1)=x\log r-\log r-\dfrac{x^2}{2r}+O\left(\dfrac{x^3}{r^2}\right)+o(1).$

Proof. It follows directly from Lemma 1 that

$$\Psi(n-x)=\log(n-x)+O\left(\frac{1}{n-x}\right)=\log n+\log\left(1-\frac{x}{n}\right)+O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right).$$

The estimate for $\Psi(n-x)$ follows directly from the estimate $\log(1-z)=-z+O(z^2)$, as z approaches zero. The same argument proves the estimate for $\Psi(h-x)$.

We prove now items (iii) and (iv). It follows from Lemma 1 that

$$\log\Gamma(n-x)-\log\Gamma(n)=(n-x)\log(n-x)-(n-x)-\frac{1}{2}\log(n-x)-n\log n+n+\frac{1}{2}\log n+o(1).$$

We use the fact that $\log(n-x)=\log n+\log(1-x/n)$ to obtain

$$\log\Gamma(n-x)-\log\Gamma(n)=-x\log n+(n-x)\log\left(1-\frac{x}{n}\right)+x-\frac{1}{2}\log\left(1-\frac{x}{n}\right)+o(1).$$

Since $x=o(r)$ implies $x=o(n)$, we have $\log(1-x/n)=o(1)$. The expansion of $\log(1-z)$ then yields

$$\log\Gamma(n-x)-\log\Gamma(n)=-x\log n+(n-x)\left(-\frac{x}{n}-\frac{x^2}{2n^2}+O\left(\frac{x^3}{n^3}\right)\right)+x+o(1),$$

and hence,

$$\log\Gamma(n-x)-\log\Gamma(n)=-x\log n+\frac{x^2}{2n}+O\left(\frac{x^3}{n^2}\right)+o(1).$$

The estimate for $\log\Gamma(r)-\log\Gamma(r-x+1)$ follows by the same arguments. □

In the following lemma we obtain an asymptotic estimate on the distribution of $\mathbf{Z}$ over $\{0,k\}$-mappings; see [2] for a similar result in a more general setting.

Lemma 3. *Let $\lambda=k-1$. If $m=m(r)$ is a sequence of positive integers such that $m=o(r)$, then the distribution of the number of cyclic nodes on a $\{0,k\}$-mapping on $n=kr$ nodes satisfies*

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z}=m)=\frac{\lambda m}{n}\exp\left(-\frac{\lambda m^2}{2n}+O\left(\frac{m^3}{r^2}\right)+o(1)\right),$$

as r approaches infinity. Moreover, if $m=m(r)$ is a sequence of real numbers such that $m\to\infty$ and $m=o(r)$ as $r\to\infty$, then $\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z}=\lfloor m\rfloor)$, $r\geq 1$, is asymptotically equivalent to the quantity above as r approaches infinity.

Proof. Let $S_1=\log\Gamma(r)-\log\Gamma(r-m+1)$ and $S_2=\log\Gamma(n-m)-\log\Gamma(n)$. It follows from Equation (3) that

$$\log\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z}=m)=\log\left(\frac{\lambda m}{k}\right)+m\log k+S_1+S_2.$$

Since $m\log k+m\log r-m\log n=0$, Lemma 2 implies

$$\log\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z}=m)=\log\left(\frac{\lambda m}{k}\right)-\log r-\frac{m^2}{2r}+\frac{m^2}{2n}+O\left(\frac{m^3}{r^2}\right)+o(1).$$

The result follows from $n=kr$ and $\lambda=k-1$.

Let $m=m(n)$ be a sequence of real numbers such that $m\to\infty$ and $m=o(r)$ as $r\to\infty$. We note that $\lfloor m\rfloor=m+O(1)=m(1+O(m^{-1}))=m(1+o(1))$. Since $(1+O(m^{-1}))^2=1+O(m^{-1})$, using the first part of the lemma we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z}=\lfloor m\rfloor)&=\frac{\lambda m}{n}(1+o(1))\exp\left(-\frac{\lambda m^2}{2n}(1+O(m^{-1}))+O\left(\frac{m^3}{r^2}\right)+o(1)\right)\\&=\frac{\lambda m}{n}\exp\left(-\frac{\lambda m^2}{2n}+O\left(\frac{\lambda m}{n}\right)+O\left(\frac{m^3}{r^2}\right)+o(1)\right).\end{aligned}$$

The result follows from the fact that, by hypothesis, $\lambda m/n=O(m/r)=o(1)$. □

Lemma 4. *Let $n, k \geq 2$ be fixed integers such that $n = kr$ for some $r \geq 1$. Then there is a positive real number $m_\#$ such that the sequence $(z_m)_m$ defined by*

$$z_m = \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} = m), \quad m \geq 1,$$

is increasing for $m < m_\#$ and decreasing for $m > m_\#$. Furthermore, $m_\# = \sqrt{n/\lambda} + O(1)$.

Proof. First we note that $z_m = 0$ for $m > r$. Let $R_m = z_{m+1}/z_m$, $1 \leq m \leq r$, be the ratio of consecutive probabilities. It suffices to find a number $m_\#$ that $R_m \geq 1$ for $1 \leq m < m_\#$ and that $R_m \leq 1$ for $m_\# \leq m \leq r$. Using Theorem 1 we obtain

$$R_m = \frac{n - km}{n - m - 1} \frac{m+1}{m}.$$

We note that $R_m < 1$ is equivalent to $(n - km)(m + 1) < m(n - m - 1)$. Since $n = kr$ and $\lambda = k - 1$, this is equivalent to

$$\frac{n}{\lambda} < m(m+1). \tag{4}$$

The function $m \mapsto m(m + 1)$ assumes the value 0 if $m = 0$ and it approaches infinity when so does m. This function is monotone increasing, hence there exists a positive real number $m_\#$ such that $R_m \geq 1$ for $m < m_\#$ and $R_m < 1$ for $m > m_\#$. Since $r(r + 1) \geq n/\lambda$, then $m_\# \leq r$. This proves the first part of the lemma. We can explicitly calculate $m_\#$ by solving Equation (4) as a quadratic equation for m:

$$m_\# = -\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\left(1 + 4 \cdot \frac{n}{\lambda}\right)^{1/2} = \sqrt{\frac{n}{\lambda}}\left(1 + O\left(\frac{k}{n}\right)\right).$$

□

In Section 5 we split the range $[1, n]$ of possible values for $\mathbf{Z}$ in three intervals using sequences $\xi_1 = \xi_1(n)$ and $\xi_2 = \xi_2(n)$, where $[\xi_1, \xi_2]$ defines a sequence of intervals that become increasingly narrow around the mode $m_\#$ (see Lemma 4). We prove in Lemma 5 below that $\mathbf{Z}$ is concentrated in the interval $[\xi_1, \xi_2]$. We observe that, for $k \geq 2$ fixed, it is proved in [2] that $\mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z}) \sim \sqrt{\pi n/2\lambda}$, hence the mode $m_\#$ has the same order of growth than the expectation of $\mathbf{Z}$.

Lemma 5. *Let $\varepsilon_n = \log^{-3/4}(\sqrt{n/\lambda})$. If $\xi_1 = m_\#^{1-\varepsilon_n}$ and $\xi_2 = m_\#^{1+\varepsilon_n}$, then, as r approaches infinity,*

(i) $\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} < \xi_1) = o(1)$,

(ii) $\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} > \xi_2) = o(1)$,

(iii) $\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\xi_1 \leq \mathbf{Z} \leq \xi_2) \sim 1$.

Proof. Since $\xi_1 < m_\#$, we note that Lemma 4 implies

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} < \xi_1) = \sum_{m < \xi_1} \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} = m) \leq \sum_{m \leq \xi_1} \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} = \lfloor \xi_1 \rfloor),$$

and hence $\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} < \xi_1) \leq \xi_1 \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} = \lfloor \xi_1 \rfloor)$. Therefore, by Lemma 3,

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} < \xi_1) \leq \frac{\lambda \xi_1^2}{n} \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda \xi_1^2}{2n}\left(1 + O\left(\frac{\xi_1 n}{\lambda r^2}\right)\right) + o(1)\right). \tag{5}$$

It follows from the definition of ξ_1 and $m_\#$ that

$$\frac{\lambda \xi_1^2}{n} \sim \frac{\lambda}{n}\left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{\lambda}}\right)^{2(1-\varepsilon_n)} = \left(\frac{n}{\lambda}\right)^{-\varepsilon_n} = \exp\left(-\varepsilon_n \log\left(\frac{n}{\lambda}\right)\right),$$

hence,

$$\frac{\lambda\xi_1^2}{n} = \exp\left(-2^{3/4}\log^{1/4}\left(\frac{n}{\lambda}\right)\right) = o(1). \tag{6}$$

Also, since $r^{-1} = O(\lambda/n)$,

$$\frac{\xi_1 n}{\lambda r^2} = O\left(\left(\frac{n}{\lambda}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}(1-\varepsilon_n)}\left(\frac{n}{\lambda}\right)^{-1}\right) = O\left(\left(\frac{n}{\lambda}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_n}\right) = o(1). \tag{7}$$

Equations (5), (6) and (7) imply that $\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} < \xi_1) = o(1)$.

In order to estimate the upper tail, we note that Lemma 4 implies $\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} > \xi_2) \leq \frac{n}{k}\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} = \lceil\xi_2\rceil)$. Therefore, using Lemma 3 we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} > \xi_2) \leq \frac{\lambda\xi_2}{k}\exp\left(-\frac{\lambda\xi_2^2}{2n}\left(1 + O\left(\frac{\xi_2 n}{\lambda r^2}\right)\right) + o(1)\right), \tag{8}$$

where arguments analogous to the ones of Equations (6) and (7) show that

$$\frac{\xi_2 n}{\lambda r^2} = o(1). \tag{9}$$

and

$$\frac{\lambda\xi_2^2}{n} \sim \exp\left(2^{3/4}\log^{1/4}\left(\frac{n}{\lambda}\right)\right). \tag{10}$$

Let $c_n = \log^{1/4}(n/\lambda)$. We note that c_n approaches infinity when so does n. Since $\log\xi_2 \sim \frac{1}{2}(1+\varepsilon_n)c_n^4$, we have from Equations (8), (9) and (10) that

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} > \xi_2) \leq \frac{\lambda}{k}\exp\left(\frac{1+\varepsilon_n}{2}c_n^4(1+o(1)) - e^{2^{3/4}c_n}(1+o(1)) + o(1)\right) = o(1).$$

Finally, the calculations above prove that

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\xi_1 \leq \mathbf{Z} \leq \xi_2) = 1 - \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} < \xi_1) - \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} > \xi_2) = 1 + o(1).$$

□

It is a well known fact that the restriction of a random unrestricted mapping f to its set $\mathcal{Z}$ of cyclic nodes is a uniform random permutation of $\mathcal{Z}$, but this also holds for $\{0,k\}$-mappings; see Lemma 1 of [2]. We state this result below for future reference. We denote the symmetric group on n elements by S_n and remark that if $f : [n] \to [n]$ is a mapping such that $\mathbf{Z}(f) = m$, then exist a unique permutation $\sigma_f \in S_m$ and an increasing function $\varphi_f : \mathcal{Z}(f) \to [m]$ such that $\varphi_f \circ f \circ \varphi_f^{-1} = \sigma_f$.

Lemma 6. *Let $n = kr$, $n, k \geq 2$. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a subset of $[n]$ with m elements and let $\sigma \in S_m$. If $m \leq n/k$, then*

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}\left(f\big|_{\mathcal{A}} = \sigma \,\middle|\, \mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{A}\right) = \frac{1}{m!}.$$

The following lemma is used in Sections 3 and 4 in our asymptotic estimates: we obtain upper and lower bounds for the expectation of $\mathbf{T}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ in the form of item (ii) of the lemma below.

Lemma 7. *Let $\langle L_r\rangle_{r=1}^{\infty}$ and $\langle A_r\rangle_{r=1}^{\infty}$ be sequences of positive real numbers. Then the following are equivalent:*

(i) $L_r = A_r(1+o(1))$ *as* $r \to \infty$*;*

(ii) For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $R = R(\varepsilon)$ such that the inequalities $(1-\varepsilon)A_r < L_r < (1+\varepsilon)A_r$ hold for all $r > R$.

Proof. First we note that $L_r = A_r(1+o(1))$ if and only if $\frac{L_r}{A_r} - 1 = o(1)$, that is, if $\lim_{r\to\infty}(\frac{L_r}{A_r} - 1) = 0$. By definition of a limit, this holds if and only if for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $R = R(\varepsilon)$ such that $|\frac{L_r}{A_r} - 1| < \varepsilon$ for all $r > R$. It can be easily checked that this condition is equivalent to $(1-\varepsilon_1)A_r < L_r < (1+\varepsilon_1)A_r$. □

3 Expected Value of T

In this section we obtain asymptotic estimates for $\mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{T})$ and $\mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{B})$ following the same strategy as in [22], that we describe next. We can write the expected value of $\mathbf{T}$ over all $\{0,k\}$-mappings as

$$\mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{T}) = \sum_{m=1}^{n} \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z}=m)\mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{T}|\mathbf{Z}=m). \tag{11}$$

If we let M_m be the expected order of a uniform random permutation of S_m, then Equation (11) and Lemma 6 imply

$$\mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{T}) = \sum_{m=1}^{n} \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z}=m)M_m. \tag{12}$$

The author in [22] combines an exact result for $\mathbb{P}_n^{\mathbb{N}}(\mathbf{Z}=m)$ with the following lemma to estimate the expected value of $\mathbf{T}$ asymptotically in the case of unrestricted mappings. We use Theorem 1 for the distribution of $\mathbf{Z}$ over $\{0,k\}$-mappings.

Lemma 8. *Let M_m be the expected order of a random permutation of S_m. Let $\beta_0 = \sqrt{8I}$, where*

$$I = \int_0^\infty \log\log\left(\frac{e}{1-e^{-t}}\right) dt. \tag{13}$$

Then, as m approaches infinity,

$$\log M_m = \beta_0\sqrt{\frac{m}{\log m}} + O\left(\frac{\sqrt{m}\log\log m}{\log m}\right).$$

In particular, if $\varepsilon_1 \in (-1,0)$, $\varepsilon_2 \in (0,1)$ and $\beta_\varepsilon = \beta_0 + \varepsilon$, there exists N_ε such that, for all $m > N_\varepsilon$,

$$\beta_{\varepsilon_1}\sqrt{\frac{m}{\log m}} < \log M_m < \beta_{\varepsilon_2}\sqrt{\frac{m}{\log m}}.$$

It is clear from Equation (12) that, if m_* is the integer that maximizes $\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z}=m)M_m$ for $1 \le m \le n$ and m_0 is an integer in $(1,n)$, then

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z}=m_0)M_{m_0} \le \mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{T}) \le n\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z}=m_*)M_{m_*}.$$

Let $n \ge 1$ and $\varepsilon \in (-1,1)$. We extend the factorials in the expression for $\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z}=m_*)$ in Theorem 1 using Gamma functions, as in Equation (3). Also, we bound the quantity M_m for large m as described in Lemma 8. For $\beta_\varepsilon = \beta_0 + \varepsilon$, let

$$\phi_{n,\varepsilon}(x) = \lambda x k^{x-1}\frac{\Gamma(r)}{\Gamma(r-x+1)}\frac{\Gamma(n-x)}{\Gamma(n)}\exp\left(\beta_\varepsilon\sqrt{\frac{x}{\log x}}\right). \tag{14}$$

The calculation of the maximum value that the real function $\phi_{n,\varepsilon}(x)$ assumes for $x \in (1,n)$ is a main ingredient in the proof of the asymptotic estimate on $\mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{T})$. In order to simplify the calculations that follow, we consider the function $\Phi_{n,\varepsilon}(x) = \log\phi_{n,\varepsilon}(x)$ and note that x_* is a local maximum of $\phi_{n,\varepsilon}(x)$ if and only if it is a local maximum of $\Phi_{n,\varepsilon}(x)$.

Proposition 1. *Let $n = kr$, $\lambda = k-1 \ge 1$ and $\varepsilon \in (-1,1)$. If, for some $0 < \alpha < 1$, $k = o(n^{1-\alpha})$ as r approaches infinity, then there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that, for sufficiently large n, the function $x \longmapsto \phi_{n,\varepsilon}(x)$ assumes a unique maximum x_* for $x \in (c,r)$. Moreover, if $k_\varepsilon = \sqrt[3]{3^5\beta_\varepsilon^4}/8$, then, as r approaches infinity,*

$$\log\phi_{n,\varepsilon}(x_*) = k_\varepsilon\frac{(n/\lambda)^{1/3}}{\log^{2/3}(n/\lambda)}(1+o(1)).$$

Proof. Let $\Phi_{n,\varepsilon} = \log \phi_{n,\varepsilon}$. We note that

$$\Phi'_{n,\varepsilon}(x) = \frac{1}{x} + \log k + \frac{d}{dx} \log \left(\frac{\Gamma(n-x)}{\Gamma(r-x+1)} \right) + \frac{\beta_\varepsilon}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\log x}{x}} \frac{\log x - 1}{\log^2 x},$$

and hence,

$$\Phi'_{n,\varepsilon}(x) = \log k + \frac{1}{x} + \Psi(r-x+1) - \Psi(n-x) + \frac{\beta_\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{x \log x}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\log x} \right), \tag{15}$$

where $\Psi(z)$ denotes the derivative of $\log \Gamma(z)$. In order to prove the uniqueness of the maximum of $\Phi_{n,\varepsilon}$, we note that

$$\Phi''_{n,\varepsilon}(x) = -\frac{1}{x^2} - \Psi'(r-x+1) + \Psi'(n-x) - \frac{\beta_\varepsilon}{4} (x^3 \log x)^{-1/2} \left(1 - \frac{3}{\log^2 x} \right). \tag{16}$$

It follows from Lemma 1 that $\Psi'(y)$ is monotone decreasing for y a positive real number, so $n \geq r+1$ implies $-\Psi'(r-x+1) + \Psi'(n-x) \leq 0$. We conclude using Equation (16) that $\Phi''_{n,\varepsilon}(x) < 0$ if $1 - 3\log^{-2} x > 0$; this condition holds if $x > c$, where $c = \exp(\sqrt{3})$.

We note that Equation (15) implies that $\Phi'_{n,\varepsilon}(x) = 0$ if and only if

$$\log k + \frac{1}{x} + \Psi(r-x+1) - \Psi(n-x) + \frac{\beta_\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{x \log x}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\log x} \right) = 0.$$

We proceed heuristically in order to obtain an intuition for the asymptotic behaviour of the point $x_* \in (1, n)$ that maximizes $\Phi_{n,\varepsilon}(x)$. By Lemma 2, for $x = o(r)$ we have

$$\Psi(r-x+1) - \Psi(n-x) \sim -\log k - \frac{(k-1)x}{n}. \tag{17}$$

Assume that the estimate (17) holds as an equality; since $\lambda = k - 1$, the equation $\Phi'_{n,\varepsilon}(x) = 0$ is equivalent to

$$\frac{1}{x} - \frac{\lambda x}{n} + \frac{\beta_\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{x \log x}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\log x} \right) = 0,$$

and multiplying this equation by x we obtain

$$\frac{\beta_\varepsilon}{2} \left(\frac{x}{\log x} \right)^{1/2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\log x} + \frac{2}{\beta_\varepsilon} \left(\frac{\log x}{x} \right)^{1/2} \right) = \frac{\lambda x^2}{n}.$$

This is equivalent to

$$(x^3 \log x)^{1/2} = \frac{\beta_\varepsilon}{2} \frac{n}{\lambda} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\log x} + \frac{2}{\beta_\varepsilon} \left(\frac{\log x}{x} \right)^{1/2} \right).$$

If the function $\Phi_{n,\varepsilon}(x)$ assumes indeed a unique maximum x_* in (c, r), $c = \exp(\sqrt{3})$, and x_* approaches infinity when so does n, we expect to have

$$(x_*^3 \log x_*)^{1/2} = \frac{\beta_\varepsilon}{2} \frac{n}{\lambda} (1 + o(1)),$$

that is,

$$x_*^3 \log x_* = \frac{\beta_\varepsilon^2}{4} \left(\frac{n}{\lambda} \right)^2 (1 + o(1)). \tag{18}$$

We use bootstrapping to obtain an approximation for the solution of Equation (18); see Section 4.1.2 of [14]. If not for the term $\log x_*$ in Equation (18), the solution would present asymptotic behavior

$x_* \sim c_1(n/\lambda)^{2/3}$ for some real number $c_1 > 0$, and thus $\log x_* \sim \frac{2}{3}\log(n/\lambda)$ as r approaches infinity. Hence,

$$x_*^3 \frac{2}{3}\log(n/\lambda) = \frac{\beta_\varepsilon^2}{4}\left(\frac{n}{\lambda}\right)^2 (1+o(1)),$$

and using the fact that $k = o(n^{1-\alpha})$ we obtain

$$x_*^3 = \frac{3\beta_\varepsilon^2}{8}\frac{(n/\lambda)^2}{\log(n/\lambda)}(1+o(1)),$$

that is,

$$x_* = \sqrt[3]{\frac{3\beta_\varepsilon^2}{8}}\frac{(n/\lambda)^{2/3}}{\log^{1/3}(n/\lambda)}(1+o(1)). \tag{19}$$

We prove now what was obtained heuristically in Equation (19). We define

$$t_* = \sqrt[3]{\frac{3\beta_\varepsilon^2}{8}}\frac{(n/\lambda)^{2/3}}{\log^{1/3}(n/\lambda)} \tag{20}$$

and consider, for some $\delta_n = o(1)$ to be determined, the interval $[a,b]$ where $a = a(n,\varepsilon)$, $b = b(n,\varepsilon)$ are defined by

$$a = t_*(1-\delta_n) \quad \text{and} \quad b = t_*(1+\delta_n).$$

We prove using Equation (15) that

$$\Phi'_{n,\varepsilon}(a) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi'_{n,\varepsilon}(b) < 0. \tag{21}$$

Equation (21) implies $x_* = t_*\big(1+O(\delta_n)\big)$, as desired. We prove Equation (21) using Equation (15), where the last term in the expression for $\Phi'_{n,\varepsilon}(b)$ is given by

$$\frac{\beta_\varepsilon}{2}\left(\frac{1}{b\log b}\right)^{1/2} = \frac{\beta_\varepsilon}{2}\left(\frac{1}{t_*(1+\delta_n)}\right)^{1/2}\left(\frac{2}{3}\log\left(\frac{n}{\lambda}\right)+O\big(\log\log n\big)\right)^{-1/2}.$$

that is,

$$\frac{\beta_\varepsilon}{2}\left(\frac{1}{b\log b}\right)^{1/2} = \frac{\beta_\varepsilon}{2}t_*^{-1/2}\left(\frac{3/2}{(1+\delta_n)\log(n/\lambda)}\right)^{1/2}\left(1+O\left(\frac{\log\log n}{\log n}\right)\right).$$

Hence, using Equation (20),

$$\frac{\beta_\varepsilon}{2}\left(\frac{1}{b\log b}\right)^{1/2} = \sqrt[3]{\frac{3\lambda\beta_\varepsilon^2}{8n\log(n/\lambda)}}(1+\delta_n)^{-1/2}\left(1+O\left(\frac{\log\log n}{\log n}\right)\right). \tag{22}$$

Since $b = o(r)$, it follows from Lemma 2 that

$$\log k + \Psi(r-b+1) - \Psi(n-b) = -\frac{\lambda t_*}{n}(1+\delta_n) + O\left(\frac{t_*^2}{r^2}\right). \tag{23}$$

Equations (15), (22) and (23) together with $\frac{1}{b} = O\left(\frac{\log\log n}{\log n}\right)$ imply

$$\Phi'_{n,\varepsilon}(b) = \frac{1}{b} + O\left(\frac{t_*^2}{r^2}\right) - \frac{\lambda t_*}{n}(1+\delta_n) + \sqrt[3]{\frac{3\lambda\beta_\varepsilon^2}{8n\log(n/\lambda)}}(1+\delta_n)^{-1/2}\left(1+O\left(\frac{\log\log n}{\log n}\right)\right);$$

using $(1+\delta_n)^{-1/2} = 1 - \frac{1}{2}\delta_n + O(\delta_n^2)$, we obtain

$$\Phi'_{n,\varepsilon}(b) = \frac{1}{b} + O\left(\frac{t_*^2}{r^2}\right) - \frac{\lambda t_*}{n}(1+\delta_n) + \sqrt[3]{\frac{3\lambda\beta_\varepsilon^2}{8n\log(n/\lambda)}}\left(1-\frac{\delta_n}{2}+O(\delta_n^2)+O\left(\frac{\log\log n}{\log n}\right)\right).$$

We note that

$$\frac{1}{b}+O\left(\frac{t_*^2}{r^2}\right)=\frac{1}{b}(1+o(1))=\frac{1}{t_*}(1+o(1))=\frac{\lambda t_*}{n}\cdot\frac{n}{\lambda t_*^2}(1+o(1))$$
$$=\frac{\lambda t_*}{n}\cdot o(n^{-\alpha/3}\log^{2/3}n).$$

Since $\lambda t_*/n=\sqrt[3]{3\lambda\beta_\varepsilon^2/8n\log(n/\lambda)}$ we conclude that

$$\Phi'_{n,\varepsilon}(b)=\sqrt[3]{\frac{3\lambda\beta_\varepsilon^2}{8n\log(n/\lambda)}}\left(-\frac{3}{2}\delta_n+O(\delta_n^2)+o(n^{-\alpha/3}\log^{2/3}n)+O\left(\frac{\log\log n}{\log n}\right)\right)$$
$$=\sqrt[3]{\frac{3\lambda\beta_\varepsilon^2}{8n\log(n/\lambda)}}\left(-\frac{3}{2}\delta_n+O(\delta_n^2)+O\left(\frac{\log\log n}{\log n}\right)\right).$$

We recall that δ_n is a quantity to be determined satisfying $\delta_n=o(1)$. It is of our interest to write

$$\Phi'_{n,\varepsilon}(b)=\sqrt[3]{\frac{3\lambda\beta_\varepsilon^2}{8n\log(n/\lambda)}}\left(-\frac{3}{2}\delta_n+o(\delta_n)\right),$$

as this would allow us to determine if $\Phi'_{n,\varepsilon}(b)$ is positive or negative, depending on the value of δ_n. To this end we choose $\delta_n=(\log\log n)^2/\log n$ and conclude that $\Phi'_{n,\varepsilon}(b)<0$ for sufficiently large n. One proves similarly that $\Phi'_{n,\varepsilon}(a)>0$, so Equation (21) holds indeed; this proves Equation (19).

We estimate now the value of $\Phi_{n,\varepsilon}(x_*)=\log\phi_{n,\varepsilon}(x_*)$. We have from Equation (14) that

$$\Phi_{n,\varepsilon}(x_*)=x_*\log k+\log\Gamma(r)-\log\Gamma(r-x_*+1)+\log\Gamma(n-x_*)-\log\Gamma(n)$$
$$+\beta_\varepsilon\sqrt{\frac{x_*}{\log x_*}}+O(\log n).$$

Since $x_*\log k+x_*\log r-x_*\log n=0$, Lemma 2 implies

$$\Phi_{n,\varepsilon}(x_*)=-\frac{\lambda x_*^2}{2n}+\beta_\varepsilon\sqrt{\frac{x_*}{\log x_*}}+O(\log n). \tag{24}$$

We note that Equation (19) implies

$$\frac{\lambda x_*^2}{2n}=\frac{1}{2}\left(\sqrt[3]{\frac{3\beta_\varepsilon^2}{8}}\right)^2\frac{(n/\lambda)^{1/3}}{\log^{2/3}(n/\lambda)}\big(1+o(1)\big) \tag{25}$$

and

$$\beta_\varepsilon\sqrt{\frac{x_*}{\log x_*}}=\beta_\varepsilon\left(\sqrt[3]{\frac{3\beta_\varepsilon^2}{8}}\right)^{1/2}\frac{(n/\lambda)^{1/3}}{\log^{1/6}(n/\lambda)}\left(\frac{2}{3}\log(n/\lambda)+O(\log\log n)\right)^{-1/2}(1+o(1)),$$

that is,

$$\beta_\varepsilon\sqrt{\frac{x_*}{\log x_*}}=\beta_\varepsilon\left(\frac{3}{2}\sqrt[3]{\frac{3\beta_\varepsilon^2}{8}}\right)^{1/2}\Big(\frac{n}{\lambda}\Big)^{1/3}\frac{1}{\log^{2/3}(n/\lambda)}\big(1+o(1)\big). \tag{26}$$

Hence, using Equations (24), (25) and (26) and the fact that $k=o(n^{1-\alpha})$, we obtain

$$\Phi_{n,\varepsilon}(x_*)=k_\varepsilon\frac{(n/\lambda)^{1/3}}{\log^{2/3}(n/\lambda)}\big(1+o(1)\big),$$

where, as desired,

$$k_\varepsilon=-\frac{1}{2}\left(\sqrt[3]{\frac{3\beta_\varepsilon^2}{8}}\right)^2+\beta_\varepsilon\left(\frac{3}{2}\sqrt[3]{\frac{3\beta_\varepsilon^2}{8}}\right)^{1/2}=\left(-\frac{1}{8}+\frac{1}{2}\right)\sqrt[3]{3^2\beta_\varepsilon^4}=\frac{\sqrt[3]{3^5\beta_\varepsilon^4}}{8}.$$

□

Lemma 9. *Let $m_* = m_*(n)$ be the integer that maximizes $\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} = m)M_m$ for $1 \le m \le n$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and let x_* be as in Proposition 1. Then m_* approaches infinity when so does n and, if $k = o(n^{1-\alpha})$ for some $0 < \alpha < 1$,*

$$\max_{1 \le m \le n} \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} = m)M_m \le \phi_{n,\varepsilon}(x_*).$$

Proof. First we prove that the integer $m_*(n)$ approaches infinity when so does n. Assume that there exists $K > 0$ and a subsequence $m_*(n_j)$, $j \ge 1$, such that $m_*(n_j) \le K$ for all $j \ge 1$. It follows that $\mathbb{P}_{n_j}^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} = m)M_m$ is bounded for $j \ge 1$. However, it follows from Lemmas 3 and 8 that, for $m = \lfloor (n/\lambda)^{1/2} \rfloor$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} = m)M_m &= (n/\lambda)^{-1/2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(1 + o(1)) + \beta_0 \frac{(n/\lambda)^{1/4}}{\frac{1}{2}\log^{1/2}(n/\lambda)}(1 + o(1))\right), \\ &= \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\log(n/\lambda) + \beta_0 \frac{(n/\lambda)^{1/4}}{\frac{1}{2}\log^{1/2}(n/\lambda)}(1 + o(1))\right),\end{aligned}$$

and this quantity approaches infinity when so does n. This contradicts the fact that $\mathbb{P}_{n_j}^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} = m)M_m$ is bounded for $j \ge 1$, so we have indeed that $m_*(n) \longrightarrow \infty$ as $n \longrightarrow \infty$.

As a consequence of the first part of the lemma, that we just proved, we have $m_* > N$ for any fixed integer N. Thus Lemma 8 and Equation (14) imply that, if $\varepsilon > 0$, then $\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} = m_*)M_{m_*} \le \phi_{n,\varepsilon}(m_*)$ holds for sufficiently large n. The result follows from the definition of x_* in Proposition 1. □

Theorem 2. *Let $k = k(r)$ and $n = n(r)$ be sequences such that $n = kr$ and, for some $0 < \alpha < 1$, $k = o(n^{1-\alpha})$ as r approaches infinity. Let $\mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{T})$ be the expected value of $\mathbf{T}$ over the class of mappings on n nodes with indegrees restricted to the set $\{0, k\}$. Then,*

$$\log \mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{T}) = k_0 \frac{(n/\lambda)^{1/3}}{\log^{2/3}(n/\lambda)}(1 + o(1)),$$

as r approaches infinity, where $\lambda = k - 1$, $k_0 = \frac{3}{2}(3I)^{2/3}$ and I is given in Equation (13).

Proof. It follows from Equation (12) that, if $1 \le m_0 \le n$ and m_* is the integer that maximizes $\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} = m)M_m$ for $1 \le m \le n$, then

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} = m_0)M_{m_0} \le \mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{T}) \le n\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} = m_*)M_{m_*}.$$

Let $\varepsilon \in (-1, 0)$. Since $m_0 = \lfloor t_* \rfloor$ implies $m_0 = t_*\big(1 + o(1)\big)$, it follows from Lemma 8, Equation (3) and Proposition 1 that

$$\log \mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{T}) \ge k_\varepsilon \frac{(n/\lambda)^{1/3}}{\log^{2/3}(n/\lambda)}(1 + o(1)). \tag{27}$$

On the other hand, if $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, then Lemma 9 implies that $\mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{T}) \le n\phi_{n,\varepsilon}(x_*)$ and thus, by Proposition 1,

$$\log \mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{T}) \le k_\varepsilon \left(\frac{n}{\lambda}\right)^{1/3} \frac{1}{\log^{2/3} n}(1 + o(1)). \tag{28}$$

Let $\varepsilon_1 > 0$. Since $k_\varepsilon \to k_0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $(1 - \varepsilon_1)k_0 < k_\varepsilon < (1 + \varepsilon_1)k_0$. The result follows from Equations (27) and (28) and Lemma 7. □

Corollary 1. *Let $k \ge 2$ be a fixed integer and let $\mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{T})$ be the expected value of $\mathbf{T}$ over the class of mappings on n nodes with indegrees restricted to the set $\{0, k\}$. Then,*

$$\log \mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{T}) = k_0 \frac{(n/\lambda)^{1/3}}{\log^{2/3}(n/\lambda)}(1 + o(1)),$$

as n approaches infinity, where $\lambda = k - 1$, $k_0 = \frac{3}{2}(3I)^{2/3}$ and I is given in Equation (13).

4 Expected Value of B

We obtain asymptotic estimates for the expectation of $\mathbf{B}$ over $\{0,k\}$-mappings using the same arguments of Section 3, so in this section we present simply a sketch of the proof of this result. Let μ_m denote the expected value of the product of the cycle lengths of a uniform random permutation of S_m. Using Lemma 6 we can write the expected value of $\mathbf{B}$ over all $\{0,k\}$-mappings on $n = kr$ nodes as

$$\mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{B}) = \sum_{m=1}^{n} \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} = m)\mu_m. \tag{29}$$

The following lemma gives an asymptotic estimate for μ_m as m approaches infinity.

Lemma 10. *Let μ_m be the expected value of the product of the cycle lengths of a random uniform permutation of S_m. Then, as m approaches infinity,*

$$\mu_m = \frac{\exp(2\sqrt{m})}{2\sqrt{\pi e}m^{3/4}}(1 + o(1)).$$

In particular, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists N_ε such that, for all $m > N_\varepsilon$,

$$(2-\varepsilon)\sqrt{m} < \log \mu_m < (2+\varepsilon)\sqrt{m}.$$

As in Section 3, we obtain upper and lower bounds for $\mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{B})$ by extending the summand in Equation (29) to real numbers and studying its maximum value. In light of Equation (3), we consider the function

$$\widetilde{\phi}_{n,\varepsilon}(x) = \lambda x k^{x-1} \frac{\Gamma(r)}{\Gamma(r-x+1)} \frac{\Gamma(n-x)}{\Gamma(n)} \exp((2+\varepsilon)\sqrt{x}), \tag{30}$$

where $n = rk$, $\lambda = k-1$ and ε denotes a real number that may be positive or negative. We consider the function $\widetilde{\Phi}_{n,\varepsilon}(x) = \log \widetilde{\phi}_{n,\varepsilon}(x)$ and note that $\widetilde{x}_*$ is a local maximum of $\widetilde{\phi}_{n,\varepsilon}(x)$ if and only if it is a local maximum of $\widetilde{\Phi}_{n,\varepsilon}(x)$. We recall that a real function is differentiable in the interval $[1,r]$ if and only if it is differentiable in $(1-\delta, r+\delta)$ for some $\delta > 0$.

Proposition 2. *Let $n = kr$, $\lambda = k-1 \geq 1$ and $\varepsilon \in (-1,1)$. If, for some $0 < \alpha < 1$, $k = o(n^{1-\alpha})$ as r approaches infinity, then there exists a unique point $\widetilde{x}_*$ that maximizes the function $\widetilde{\Phi}_{n,\varepsilon}(x) = \log \widetilde{\phi}_{n,\varepsilon}(x)$ for $x \in [1,r]$, where $n = rk$. Moreover,*

$$\widetilde{\Phi}_{n,\varepsilon}(\widetilde{x}_*) = \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)^{4/3} \frac{3}{2} \left(\frac{n}{\lambda}\right)^{1/3} (1 + o(1)).$$

Proof. It follows from the definition of the function Ψ that, for $x \in [1,r]$,

$$\widetilde{\Phi}'_{n,\varepsilon}(x) = \log k + \frac{1}{x} + \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) x^{-1/2} + \Psi(r-x+1) - \Psi(n-x). \tag{31}$$

Using basic arguments one is able to prove that $\widetilde{\Phi}'_{n,\varepsilon}(1) > 0$ and $\widetilde{\Phi}'_{n,\varepsilon}(r) < 0$ for sufficiently large r. This proves the existence of a point $\widetilde{x}_*$ that is a local maximum of $\widetilde{\Phi}_{n,\varepsilon}(x)$. Also,

$$\widetilde{\Phi}''_{n,\varepsilon}(x) = -x^{-2} - \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{4}\right) x^{-3/2} - \Psi'(r-x+1) + \Psi'(n-x).$$

Since $r - x + 1 < n - x$, it follows from Lemma 1 that $\Psi'(n-x) < \Psi'(r-x+1)$ and thus $\widetilde{\Phi}''_{n,\varepsilon}(x) < 0$ for $x \in [1,r]$. This proves that $\widetilde{x}_*$ is unique.

In order to obtain a heuristic estimate for $\widetilde{x}_*$ as r approaches infinity, we use Equation (31) and items (i) and (ii) of Lemma 2, assuming $\widetilde{x}_* = o(r)$, to obtain

$$\widetilde{\Phi}'_{n,\varepsilon}(x) = \frac{1}{x} + \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) x^{-1/2} - \frac{(k-1)x}{n} + O\left(\frac{x^2}{r^2}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{r}\right). \tag{32}$$

We recall that $\lambda = k - 1$ and consider the equation

$$\frac{1}{x} + \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) x^{-1/2} - \frac{\lambda x}{n} = 0.$$

This equation suggests that

$$\widetilde{x}_* = \left(\left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \frac{n}{\lambda}\right)^{2/3} \big(1 + o(1)\big). \tag{33}$$

One is able to prove that Equation (33) holds indeed by noting that, for $\delta_r = r^{-1/4}$, Equation (31) implies

$$\widetilde{\Phi}'_{n,\varepsilon}\left(\left[\left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \frac{n}{\lambda}\right]^{2/3} (1 + \delta_r)\right) < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{\Phi}'_{n,\varepsilon}\left(\left[\left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \frac{n}{\lambda}\right]^{2/3} (1 - \delta_r)\right) > 0.$$

We are able to estimate the value of $\widetilde{\Phi}_{n,\varepsilon}(\widetilde{x}_*)$ by noting that, as a consequence of Equation (31) and items (iii) and (iv) of Lemma 2, we have

$$\widetilde{\Phi}_{n,\varepsilon}(\widetilde{x}_*) = -(k-1)\frac{\widetilde{x}_*^2}{2n} + (2 + \varepsilon)\sqrt{\widetilde{x}_*} + O(\log n).$$

The result follows from the definition of $\widetilde{x}_*$ in Equation (33). □

Theorem 3. *Let $k = k(r)$ and $n = n(r)$ be sequences such that $n = kr$ and, for some $0 < \alpha < 1$, $k = o(n^{1-\alpha})$ as r approaches infinity. For $r \geq 1$, let $\mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{B})$ be the expected value of $\mathbf{B}$ over the class of mappings on n nodes with indegrees restricted to the set $\{0, k\}$. Then, as r approaches infinity,*

$$\log \mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{B}) = \frac{3}{2}\left(\frac{n}{\lambda}\right)^{1/3} (1 + o(1)),$$

where $\lambda = k - 1$.

Proof. First we prove that the integer $\widetilde{m}_* = \widetilde{m}_*(n)$ that maximizes $\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}[\mathbf{Z} = m]\mu_m$ for $1 \leq m \leq n$ tends to infinity when so does r. Indeed, if there exists $C > 0$ and a subsequence $\widetilde{m}_*(n_j), j \geq 1$, such that $\widetilde{m}_*(n_j) \leq C$ for all $j \geq 1$, then $\mathbb{P}_{n_j}^{\{0,k\}}[\mathbf{Z} = m]\mu_m$ is bounded for all $j \geq 1$, $1 \leq m \leq n_j$. However, it follows from Lemmas 3 and 10 that, for $m = \lfloor (n/\lambda)^{1/2} \rfloor$, $\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}[\mathbf{Z} = m]\mu_m = \exp\big(2n^{\alpha/4} + O(\log n)\big)$ approaches infinity when so does r; this contradicts the assumption that $\widetilde{m}_*(n)$ is bounded.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$. It follows from Equations (29) and (3), Lemma 10 and Proposition 2 that

$$\log \mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}[\mathbf{B}] \leq \log n + \widetilde{\Phi}_{n,\varepsilon}(\widetilde{x}_*) = \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)^{4/3} \frac{3}{2}\left(\frac{n}{\lambda}\right)^{1/3} (1 + o(1)), \tag{34}$$

and, for $m_0 = \lfloor \widetilde{x}_* \rfloor$,

$$\log \mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}[\mathbf{B}] \geq \widetilde{\Phi}_{n,-\varepsilon}(m_0) = \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)^{4/3} \frac{3}{2}\left(\frac{n}{\lambda}\right)^{1/3} (1 + o(1)). \tag{35}$$

The result follows from an application of Lemma 7 similar to that in the proof of Theorem 2. □

Corollary 2. *Let $k \geq 2$ be a fixed integer and let $\mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{B})$ be the expected value of $\mathbf{B}$ over the class of mappings on n nodes with indegrees restricted to the set $\{0, k\}$. Then, as n approaches infinity,*

$$\log \mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{B}) = \frac{3}{2}\left(\frac{n}{\lambda}\right)^{1/3} (1 + o(1)),$$

where $\lambda = k - 1$.

The following corollary follows at once from the asymptotic equivalence between the cardinality r of the range of $\{0, k\}$-mappings is asymptotic equivalent to n/λ.

5 Lognormality

Let $\mu_n^* = \frac{1}{2}\log^2(\sqrt{n})$, $\sigma_n^* = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\log^{3/2}(\sqrt{n})$ and $\mu_n = \frac{1}{2}\log^2(\sqrt{\frac{n}{\lambda}})$, $\sigma_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\log^{3/2}(\sqrt{\frac{n}{\lambda}})$. Harris proved that the sequence of random variables defined over the space of random mappings on n nodes as $X_n = (\log \mathbf{T} - \mu_n^*)/\sigma_n^*$, $n \geq 1$, converges weakly to a standard normal distribution [15]. In this section we prove an analogue of this result for $\{0, k\}$-mappings:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}} \left(\frac{\log \mathbf{T} - \mu_n}{\sigma_n} \leq x \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{x} e^{-t^2/2} dt. \tag{36}$$

The analogous result for the parameter $\mathbf{B}$ is proved from Equation (36) by showing that the random variable $\chi_n = \log \mathbf{B} - \log \mathbf{T}$, when properly normalized, converges in probability to zero.

We write the probability in Equation (36) using the law of total probability: we partition the space of $\{0, k\}$-mappings according to the values $m \in [1, r]$ that $\mathbf{Z}$ assumes. Let ξ_1, ξ_2 be as in Lemma 5. We partition the interval $[1, r]$ into three subintervals:

- $I_1 = \{m : 1 \leq m < \xi_1\}$,
- $I_2 = \{m : \xi_1 \leq m \leq \xi_2\}$,
- $I_3 = \{m : \xi_2 < m \leq r\}$.

Then, by the law of total probability,

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}} (\log \mathbf{T} \leq \mu_n + x\sigma_n) = \zeta_1 + \zeta_2 + \zeta_3, \tag{37}$$

where

$$\zeta_j = \sum_{m \in I_j} \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} = m) \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\log \mathbf{T} \leq \mu_n + x\sigma_n | \mathbf{Z} = m). \tag{38}$$

The conditional probabilities $\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\log \mathbf{T} \leq \mu_n + x\sigma_n | \mathbf{Z} = m)$ in Equation (38) can be trivially bounded by 1, so Lemma 5 clearly implies that

$$\zeta_1 = o(1) \text{ and } \zeta_3 = o(1). \tag{39}$$

We prove next that ζ_2 provides the asymptotic main term in (37). We use the following theorem, the special case $\theta = 1$ of Theorem 1.2 of [6], that represents a stronger version of Erdös and Turán's famous result [10]. We denote by $\mathbf{Q}_m$ the uniform probability measure on the symmetric group S_m and by $\phi(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\infty}^{x} e^{-t^2/2} dt$ the standard normal distribution.

Theorem 4 ([6]). *Let $\alpha_m = \frac{1}{2}\log^2 m + \log m \log\log m$ and $\beta_m = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\log^{3/2} m$. Then there exists a constant $K > 0$ such that, for all real numbers x and all integers $m > 1$,*

$$\left| \mathbf{Q}_m (\log \mathbf{T} \leq \alpha_m + x\beta_m) - \phi(x) \right| \leq \frac{K}{\sqrt{\log m}}.$$

In the following result we use Lemma 6 and Theorem 4 to approximate all the conditional probabilities in the definition of ζ_2. It turns out that the interval $[\xi_1, \xi_2]$ is narrow enough so that all conditional probabilities in the summand of ζ_2 are approximately $\phi(x)$.

Lemma 11. *For $n = kr$ and $m \in I_2$, let*

$$\delta_x(m, n) = \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}} (\log \mathbf{T} \leq \mu_n + x\sigma_n | \mathbf{Z} = m) - \phi(x),$$

and let $\Delta_x(n) = \max\{|\delta_x(m, n)|, m \in I_2\}$. Then, for any fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\Delta_x(n) = o(1)$ as r approaches infinity.

Proof. It follows from Lemma 6 that, for any $m \in I_2$,

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}\left(\frac{\log \mathbf{T} - \mu_n}{\sigma_n} \le x | \mathbf{Z} = m\right) = \mathbf{Q}_m\left(\frac{\log \mathbf{T} - \mu_n}{\sigma_n} \le x\right). \tag{40}$$

Let α_m and β_m be as in Theorem 4. Define $y = y(n, m, x)$ to be the real number for which $\mu_n + x\sigma_n = \alpha_m + y\beta_m$. Then,

$$\mathbf{Q}_m\left(\frac{\log \mathbf{T} - \mu_n}{\sigma_n} \le x\right) = \mathbf{Q}_m\left(\frac{\log \mathbf{T} - \alpha_m}{\beta_m} \le y\right). \tag{41}$$

Therefore, by Equations (40) and (41),

$$|\delta_x(m,n)| = \left|\mathbf{Q}_m\left(\frac{\log \mathbf{T} - \alpha_m}{\beta_m} \le y\right) - \phi(x)\right|,$$

and thus, by the triangle inequality,

$$|\delta_x(m,n)| \le \left|\mathbf{Q}_m\left(\frac{\log \mathbf{T} - \alpha_m}{\beta_m} \le y\right) - \phi(y)\right| + |\phi(y) - \phi(x)|. \tag{42}$$

We note that Theorem 4 implies that, for some constant $K_1 > 0$,

$$\left|\mathbf{Q}_m\left(\frac{\log \mathbf{T} - \alpha_m}{\beta_m} \le y\right) - \phi(y)\right| \le \frac{K_1}{\sqrt{\log m}}. \tag{43}$$

Also, from the definition of ϕ we obtain

$$|\phi(y) - \phi(x)| = \left|\int_x^y \frac{e^{-t^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\, dt\right| \le |y - x|. \tag{44}$$

Combining Equations (42)-(44) we obtain

$$|\delta_x(m,n)| \le \frac{K_1}{\sqrt{\log m}} + |y - x|. \tag{45}$$

In order to estimate $|y - x|$, we recall that the definition of y implies

$$y - x = \frac{(\mu_n - \alpha_m) + x(\sigma_n - \beta_m)}{\beta_m}. \tag{46}$$

Since $I_2 = \{m : m_\#^{1-\varepsilon_n} \le m \le m_\#^{1+\varepsilon_n}\}$, where $m_\# = \sqrt{n/\lambda} + O(1)$ and $\varepsilon_n = \log^{-3/4}(\sqrt{n/\lambda})$, we have for $m \in I_2$ that

$$\log m = \log\left(\sqrt{n/\lambda}\right)(1 + O(\varepsilon_n)).$$

Combining this with the definitions $\beta_m = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\log^{3/2} m$ and $\sigma_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\log^{3/2}\sqrt{n/\lambda}$, we obtain $\beta_m = \sigma_n(1 + O(\varepsilon_n))$, hence

$$\sigma_n - \beta_m = O(\sigma_n \varepsilon_n) = O(\beta_m \varepsilon_n). \tag{47}$$

Using the same argument we prove that $\mu_n = \alpha_m(1 + O(\varepsilon_n))$, and thus

$$\alpha_m - \mu_n = O(\alpha_m \varepsilon_n) = O\left(\beta_m \log^{-1/4}\left(\sqrt{n/\lambda}\right)\right). \tag{48}$$

It follows from Equations (46)-(48) that

$$y - x = O\left(\log^{-1/4}\left(\sqrt{n/\lambda}\right)\right) + O(|x|\varepsilon_n). \tag{49}$$

Since $m > \xi_1 = O\left(\log\sqrt{n/\lambda}\right)$, it follows from Equations (45) and (49) that

$$|\delta_x(m,n)| = O\left(\log^{-1/2}\left(\sqrt{n/\lambda}\right)\right) + O\left(\log^{-1/4}\left(\sqrt{n/\lambda}\right)\right) + O(|x|\log^{-3/4}(n)).$$

We note that the right-hand side of the equation above depends n and x, but not on m. The result follows at once from the estimate

$$\Delta_x(n) = \max_{m\in I_2}|\delta_x(m,n)| \leq \frac{K_2}{\log^{1/4}(\sqrt{n/\lambda})} + \frac{K_3|x|}{\log^{3/4}(\sqrt{n/\lambda})}, \tag{50}$$

where K_2, K_3 are positive constants. □

Theorem 5. *Let $k = k(r)$ and $n = n(r)$ be sequences such that $n = kr$ and, for some $0 < \alpha < 1$, $k = o(n^{1-\alpha})$ as r approaches infinity. Let $\mu_n = \frac{1}{2}\log^2(\sqrt{n/\lambda})$, $\sigma_n^2 = \frac{1}{3}\log^3(\sqrt{n/\lambda})$. Let $\mathbf{T}(f)$ denote the least common multiple of the length of the cycles of a mapping f and, for $r \geq 1$, let X_n be the random variable defined over the space of $\{0,k\}$-mappings on n nodes as $X_n = (\log\mathbf{T} - \mu_n)/\sigma_n$. Then the sequence defined by X_n converges in distribution to a standard normal distribution. In other words, for any real number x,*

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}\left(\log\mathbf{T} \leq \mu_n + x\sigma_n\right) = \phi(x) + o_x(1),$$

as r approaches infinity, where the notation $o_x(\cdot)$ indicates that the error term depends on x. Moreover, if c is a positive constant, then the convergence is uniform for $|x| \leq c\sqrt{\log n}$.

Proof. It follows from Equation (37) that

$$|\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}\left(\log\mathbf{T} \leq \mu_n + x\sigma_n\right) - \phi(x)| = |\zeta_1 + \zeta_2 + \zeta_3 - \phi(x)|,$$

hence, by the triangle inequality,

$$|\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}\left(\log\mathbf{T} \leq \mu_n + x\sigma_n\right) - \phi(x)| \leq |\zeta_2 - \phi(x)| + \zeta_1 + \zeta_3. \tag{51}$$

Using Lemma 5 we are able to write

$$\phi(x) = \sum_{m\in I_2}\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} = m)\phi(x) + o(1).$$

Therefore, by the triangle inequality and Equation (38),

$$|\zeta_2 - \phi(x)| \leq \sum_{m\in I_2}\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} = m)\left|\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}\left(\frac{\log\mathbf{T} - \mu_n}{\sigma_n} \leq x\middle|\mathbf{Z} = m\right) - \phi(x)\right| + o(1).$$

It follows from Lemma 11 that

$$|\zeta_2 - \phi(x)| \leq \Delta_x(n)\sum_{m\in I_2}\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} = m) + o(1) = o(1). \tag{52}$$

The first part of the theorem follows from Equations (51), (39) and (52). We conclude that uniform convergence holds for $|x| \leq c\sqrt{\log n}$, for some positive constant c, by noting that the x-dependent bound (50) can be replaced by $K_4\log^{-1/4}(\sqrt{n/\lambda})$, for some $K_4 > 0$. □

In order to prove asymptotic lognormality for the parameter $\mathbf{B}$, we use Theorem 6 below, where it is proved that the normalized difference between $\log\mathbf{B}$ and $\log\mathbf{T}$ converges in probability to zero. We consider this result of independent interest.

Theorem 6. *Let $k = k(r)$ and $n = n(r)$ be sequences such that $n = kr$ and, for some $0 < \alpha < 1$, $k = o(n^{1-\alpha})$ as r approaches infinity. For $r \geq 1$, let χ_n be the random variable defined over $\{0, k\}$-mappings on n nodes as $\chi_n = (\log \mathbf{B} - \log \mathbf{T})/\sigma_n$, where $\sigma_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \log^{3/2}(\sqrt{n/\lambda})$. Then the sequence defined by χ_n converges in probability to zero. In other words, for all $\varepsilon > 0$ we have*

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\chi_n > \varepsilon) = o(1),$$

as r approaches infinity.

Proof. By the Law of Total Probability,

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\chi_n > \varepsilon) = \sum_{m=1}^{r} \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} = m)\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\chi_n > \varepsilon | \mathbf{Z} = m).$$

As described in the beginning of this section, we split the range $[1, r]$ into the three intervals I_1, I_2, I_3. The same arguments leading up to Equation (39) prove that the contributions from I_1 and I_3 are negligible, so

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\chi_n > \varepsilon) \leq \sum_{m \in I_2} \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} = m)\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\chi_n > \varepsilon | \mathbf{Z} = m) + o(1),$$

and, since $\sum_{m \in I_2} \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} = m) \leq 1$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\chi_n > \varepsilon) \leq \max_{m \in I_2} \mathbf{Q}_m(\log \mathbf{B} - \log \mathbf{T} > \varepsilon \sigma_n) + o(1).$$

It is known (e.g. [5], page 333) that the expected value of $\log \mathbf{B} - \log \mathbf{T}$ over random uniform permutations of S_m is upper bounded by $c(\log \log m)^2 \log m$, for some constant c. It follows from Markov's Inequality (Section 3.4 of [20]) that

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\chi_n > \varepsilon) \leq \frac{c(\log \log \xi_2)^2 \log \xi_2}{\varepsilon \sigma_n} = o(1),$$

as desired. □

We note that, if $Y_n = (\log \mathbf{B} - \mu_n)/\sigma_n$, then $Y_n = X_n + \chi_n$ where $X_n = (\log \mathbf{T} - \mu_n)/\sigma_n$ converges in distribution to a standard normal distribution and $\chi_n = (\log \mathbf{B} - \log \mathbf{T})/\sigma_n$ converges in probability to zero. Lognormality for the parameter $\mathbf{B}$ follows at once from Slutsky's Theorem; see Theorem 15 in Section 6.2 of [20]. To obtain uniform convergence to the standard normal distribution, analogous to the one obtained for the parameter T in Theorem 5, we can use the following lemma.

Lemma 12. *Let $\{X_n\}, \{\chi_n\} : \Omega_n^{\{0,k\}} \to \mathbb{R}$ be sequences of random variables with $\chi_n > 0$ for $n = 1, 2, \ldots$ and $c > 0$ be a constant. If the following conditions hold*

i) $\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(X_n \leq x) = \phi(x) + o(1)$ for all x such that $|x| \leq c \log n$, where the $o(1)$ term does not depend on x.

ii) $\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\chi_n \geq \varepsilon) = o_\varepsilon(1)$ for each $\varepsilon > 0$, as n approaches infinity.

Then,

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(X_n + \chi_n \leq x) = \phi(x) + o(1)$$

for all x such that $|x| \leq \frac{c}{2} \log n$, where the $o(1)$ term does not depend on x.

Proof. Let $\delta > 0$. First we note that

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(X_n + \chi_n \leq x) \leq \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(X_n \leq x) = \phi(x) + o(1).$$

Thus, there exists $N_1 = N_1(\delta)$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(X_n + \chi_n \leq x) - \phi(x) \leq \delta, \tag{53}$$

for $|x| \leq c \log n$ and $n \geq N_1$. We prove now that

$$\phi(x) - \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(X_n + \chi_n \leq x) \leq \delta, \tag{54}$$

for $|x| \leq \frac{c}{2} \log n$ and for $n \geq N_2 = N_2(\delta)$. We note that ϕ is continuous, monotone and bounded, hence ϕ is uniformly continuous in $\mathbb{R}$. Thus there exists $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\delta) > 0$ such that, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\phi(x - \varepsilon) \geq \phi(x) - \frac{\delta}{2}. \tag{55}$$

We note that ε can be taken in the interval $(0, 1)$.

Let x be a real number such that $|x| \leq \frac{c}{2} \log n$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(X_n + \chi_n > x) &\leq \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(X_n + \chi_n > x, \chi_n \leq \varepsilon) + \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\chi_n \geq \varepsilon) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(X_n > x - \varepsilon) + \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\chi_n \geq \varepsilon).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(X_n + \chi_n \leq x) \geq \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(X_n \leq x - \varepsilon) - \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\chi_n \geq \varepsilon)$ and, by (ii),

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(X_n + \chi_n \leq x) \geq \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(X_n \leq x - \varepsilon) + o_\varepsilon(1).$$

We note that, since $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, for sufficiently large n and $x \in \left[-\frac{c}{2} \log n, \frac{c}{2} \log n\right]$ we have $x - \varepsilon \in [-c \log n, c \log n]$. Hence from (i) we obtain...

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(X_n + \chi_n \leq x) \geq \phi(x - \varepsilon) + o(1) + o_\varepsilon(1).$$

It follows from Equation (55) that $\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(X_n + \chi_n \leq x) \geq \phi(x) - \frac{\delta}{2} + o(1) + o_\varepsilon(1)$, that is, $\phi(x) - \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(X_n + \chi_n \leq x) \leq \frac{\delta}{2} + o(1) + o_\varepsilon(1)$. Since ε depends on δ, there exists $N_2 = N_2(\delta)$ such that Equation (54) holds. The real number x is arbitrary, hence holds for all $|x| \leq \frac{c}{2} \log n$.

By Equations (53) and (54), we have

$$\sup_{x : |x| \leq \frac{c}{2} \log n} |\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(X_n + \chi_n \leq x) - \phi(x)| \leq \delta,$$

for all $n \geq \max\{N_1, N_2\}$. Since $\delta > 0$ is arbitrary we conclude the proof. □

Theorem 7. *Let $k = k(r)$ and $n = n(r)$ be sequences such that $n = kr$ and, for some $0 < \alpha < 1$, $k = o(n^{1-\alpha})$ as r approaches infinity. Let $\mu_n = \frac{1}{2} \log^2(\sqrt{n/\lambda})$, $\sigma_n^2 = \frac{1}{3} \log^3(\sqrt{n/\lambda})$. Let $\mathbf{B}(f)$ denote the product of the length of the cycles of a mapping f and, for $r \geq 1$, let Y_n be the random variable defined over the space of $\{0, k\}$-mappings on n nodes as $Y_n = (\log \mathbf{B} - \mu_n)/\sigma_n$. Then the sequence defined by Y_n converges in distribution to the normal distribution. In other words, for any real number x,*

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\log \mathbf{B} \leq \mu_n + x\sigma_n) = \phi(x) + o_x(1),$$

as r approaches infinity. Moreover, if c is a positive constant, then the convergence is uniform for $|x| \leq c\sqrt{\log n}$.

6 Heuristics

In the analysis of his factorization method [19], Pollard conjectured that quadratic polynomials modulo large primes behave like random mappings with respect to their average rho length. However, it should be noted that the indegree distribution of a class of mappings impacts heavily the asymptotic distribution of

a number of parameters [2]; the indegree distribution of a mapping f on n nodes is defined as the sequence $n_j = \#\{y \in [n] \colon |f^{-1}(y)| = j\}$, $j \geq 0$. Since a quadratic polynomial modulo an odd prime p has a very particular indegree distribution, namely $(n_0, n_1, n_2) = (\frac{p-1}{2}, 1, \frac{p-1}{2})$, one might wonder if $\{0, 2\}$-mappings do not represent a better heuristic model. Furthermore, there are classes of polynomials from which one might not expect the typical random mapping behavior, and it is possible to use different classes of mappings as heuristic models. This is the case for the polynomials of the form $f(x) = x^d + a \in \mathbb{F}_p[x]$, where, as usual, $\mathbb{F}_q$ denotes the finite field on q elements. Their indegree distribution satisfies

$$n_0 = \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)(q-1), \quad n_1 = 1, \quad n_k = \frac{1}{k}(p-1). \tag{56}$$

where $k = \gcd(q-1, d)$. We note that the indegree distribution of these polynomials satisfies $n_0/p \sim 1 - 1/k$, $n_1/p \sim 0$ and $n_k/p \sim 1/k$ as p approaches infinity. We refer to the polynomials with indegree distribution (56) as $\{0, k\}$-*polynomials*. As a particular case, we note that a polynomial of the form $x^k + a \in \mathbb{F}_p[x]$, $p \equiv 1 \pmod{k}$, is a $\{0, k\}$-polynomial.

In this section we consider classes of $\{0, k\}$-mappings, treated in the previous sections, as heuristic models for $\{0, k\}$-polynomials. It is important to note that there are polynomials of degree $d > k$ whose indegree distribution also satisfies (56): for instance, polynomials of the form $x^4 + a \in \mathbb{F}_p[x]$, $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, have indegree distribution (56) with $k = 2$ [18]. Our focus lies on polynomials of a certain degree modulo large prime numbers, hence from this point on we restrict our attention to $\{0, k\}$-mappings with $k \geq 2$ fixed, even though the results of the previous sections hold in a more general setting. The asymptotic results in this section are taken as n approaches infinity.

The interest in the heuristic approximation mentioned above can be attributed at least in part to the wealth of asymptotic results on the statistics of mappings with indegree restrictions, when compared to the literature on the number theoretical setting; see for example [2, 9]. The main term of several asymptotic results on the statistics of a class $\mathcal{F}$ of mappings with restrictions on the indegrees depends on its asymptotic average coalescence $\lambda = \lambda(\mathcal{F})$, defined as in Section 2. This is the case for the rho length of a random node, parameter involved in the analysis of Pollard factorization algorithm. Since $\lambda = 1$ for unrestricted mappings and $\{0, 2\}$-mappings, these two classes represent equally accurate models for the average rho length of quadratic polynomials [18]. It is curious that the knowledge of the indegree distribution of these polynomials does not represent an improvement on the heuristic in this case. It is worth noting that our asymptotic results on different classes of $\{0, k\}$-mappings are determined by their coalescence λ as well; compare Theorems 2 and 3 with Equations (1) and (2). Compare μ_n and μ_m^* with σ_n and σ_m^* as well, under the light of the fact that the expected number of cyclic nodes over all unrestricted or $\{0, k\}$-mappings are asymptotically equivalent to $\sqrt{\pi n/2}$ and $\sqrt{\pi n/2\lambda}$, respectively. We note that if $\log k = o(\log n)$ then $\mu_n \sim \mu_n^*$ and $\sigma_n \sim \sigma_n^*$ as r approaches infinity.

6.1 Sampling $\{0, k\}$-Mappings

In our experiments, for each prime number $p \equiv 1 \pmod{k}$ considered, we select p $\{0, k\}$-mappings uniformly at random according to the following algorithm. For f a $\{0, k\}$-mapping, let $\mathcal{N}_k = \{y \in [n] \colon |f^{-1}(y)| = k\}$. We note that $|\mathcal{N}_k| = r$. We determine the set $\mathcal{N}_k$ by selecting a permutation $\sigma = \sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_n \in S_n$ uniformly at random and defining $\mathcal{N}_k = \{\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_r\}$. The image $f(x)$ of every element $x \in [n]$ is defined by choosing again a permutation $\tau = \tau_1 \cdots \tau_n \in S_n$ uniformly at random. The first k elements define the preimage of σ_1: $f^{-1}(\sigma_1) = \{\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_k\}$. The next k elements determine the preimage of the element of σ_2, and so on. We make this process precise in the algorithm below.

Algorithm 1: GENERATING A RANDOM UNIFORM $\{0,k\}$-MAPPING.

Input: Integers $r \geq 1$ and $k \geq 2$.
Output: $\{0,k\}$-mapping f on $n = kr$ nodes.

```
Pick a permutation σ = σ_1 ··· σ_n ∈ S_n uniformly at random.
Pick a permutation τ = τ_1 ··· τ_n ∈ S_n uniformly at random.
for i = 0, ..., r − 1 do
    for j = 1, ..., k do
        f(τ[ik + j]) = σ[i + 1]          // τ[ℓ] denotes τ_ℓ, same for σ[ℓ].
    end
end
return f.
```

Theorem 8. *Assume that the permutations σ, τ in Steps 1 and 2 of Algorithm 1 are uniform random permutation of S_n. Then Algorithm 1 returns a uniform random $\{0,k\}$-mapping.*

Proof. Let f be a $\{0,k\}$-mapping on n nodes and $\mathcal{N}_k$ as above. We note that the probability that Step 1 returns a given permutation $\sigma \in S_n$ is $1/n!$. Also, the number of permutation that define the same set $\mathcal{N}_k = \{\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_r\}$ is given by the number of permutations of $\{\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_r\}$ times the number of permutations of $\{\sigma_{r+1}, \ldots, \sigma_n\}$. Hence the probability $p_{\mathcal{N}_k}$ that the set $\mathcal{N}_k$ is chosen in Step 1 is

$$p_{\mathcal{N}_k} = \frac{r!(n-r)!}{n!}. \tag{57}$$

Again, the probability that a given permutation is chosen in Step 2 is $1/n!$. Moreover, the number of permutations that define the same *sequence of sets* $\mathcal{A}_i = f^{-1}(\sigma_i)$, $i = 1, \ldots, r$, equals the product of the number of permutations on each A_i. Therefore, the probability $p_{(A_1,\ldots,A_r)}$ that $(A_1, \ldots, A_r)$ is chosen satisfies

$$p_{(A_1,\ldots,A_r)} = \frac{k! \cdots k!}{n!} = \frac{(k!)^r}{n!}. \tag{58}$$

It follows from Equations (57) and (58) that the probability that f is returned by Algorithm 1 is $p_{\mathcal{N}_k} \cdot p_{(A_1,\ldots,A_r)} = r!(n-r)!(k!)^r/(n!)^2$ which does not depend on f. □

It should be stressed that our experimental results, presented in Section 6.2 below, are based on sampling, so a number of problems can occur in the numerical estimate of the expectation of a random variable. Theorem 9 below is relevant in this sense, where it is proved that it is required a very large number of samples from the space of $\{0,k\}$-mappings until a mapping with a substantial value of $\mathbf{T}$ is revealed. To simplify notation, let $\vec{S} = f_1, f_2, f_3, \ldots$ denote a sequence of independent random samples chosen uniformly at random from the class of $\{0,k\}$-mappings on n nodes. We consider the sequence of numbers defined by $\xi = \xi(n) = \left(\mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{T})\right)^a$, where a depends on n as well. We define

$$\mathbf{N} = \mathbf{N}(n, \vec{S}, a) = \min\{t : \mathbf{T}(f_t) \geq \xi\}.$$

Thus $\mathbf{N}$ has a geometric distribution: for $j \geq 1$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{N} = j) = \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{T} \geq \xi) \cdot \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{T} < \xi)^{j-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{N}) = \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}_n(\mathbf{T} \geq \xi)}. \tag{59}$$

We note that if $a = \log^{-1/4} n$ then the ratio between ξ and $\mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{T})$ approaches zero as $n \to \infty$. We prove in Theorem 9 that this particular choice of a defines a random variable $\mathbf{N}$ whose expectation has exponential growth. We remember that in this section we are suppose that $k \geq 2$ is a fixed integer.

Lemma 13. *Let f be a $\{0,k\}$-mapping on $n = kr$ nodes and let $\alpha = \frac{n^{2/3}}{\log^3 n}$. If $a^{-1} \log^{-1/3} n = o(1)$ then, for sufficiently large n, $\mathbf{Z}(f) \leq \alpha$ implies $\mathbf{T}(f) < \xi$.*

Proof. If $f : [n] \to [n]$ is a $\{0, k\}$-mapping and $\mathbf{Z}(f) = m$, then clearly $\mathbf{T}(f) \leq \max_{\sigma \in S_m} \mathbf{T}(\sigma)$. It follows from Landau's theorem [17, 23] that

$$\max_{\sigma \in S_m} \mathbf{T}(\sigma) = \exp\left(\sqrt{m \log m}(1 + o(1))\right),$$

hence, for sufficiently large n,

$$\mathbf{T}(f) < \exp\left(2\sqrt{m \log m}\right). \tag{60}$$

We note that, if $m \leq \alpha$, then

$$m \log m \leq \alpha \log \alpha = \frac{n^{2/3}}{\log^3 n}\left(\frac{2}{3}\log n - \log\log^3 n\right) \leq \frac{2}{3}\frac{n^{2/3}}{\log^2 n} \leq \frac{n^{2/3}}{\log^2 n}.$$

Therefore,

$$2\sqrt{m \log m} \leq 2\frac{n^{1/3}}{\log n}, \tag{61}$$

where Theorem 2 and the definition of ξ and α imply

$$\frac{2n^{1/3}\log^{-1} n}{\log \xi} = O\left(a^{-1}\log^{-1/3} n\right).$$

If $a^{-1}\log^{-1/3} n = o(1)$ then $\exp\left(2n^{1/3}\log^{-1} n\right) < \xi$ for sufficiently large n. The result follows from Equations (60) and (61). □

Theorem 9. *If $a^{-1}\log^{-1/3} n = o(1)$ then, for sufficiently large n, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{N}) > \exp\left(\frac{\lambda n^{1/3}}{3\log^6 n}\right),$$

and, in addition,

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}\left(\mathbf{N} \leq \exp\left(\frac{\lambda n^{1/3}}{4\log^6 n}\right)\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda n^{1/3}}{12\log^6 n}\right).$$

Proof. Let $\alpha = \frac{n^{2/3}}{\log^3 n}$. Using first the law of Total Probability we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{T} \geq \xi) =& \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{T} \geq \xi | \mathbf{Z} \leq \alpha) \cdot \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} \leq \alpha) \\ &+ \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{T} \geq \xi | \mathbf{Z} > \alpha) \cdot \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} > \alpha).\end{aligned}$$

We note that Lemma 13 implies $\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{T} \geq \xi | \mathbf{Z} \leq \alpha) = 0$ for r large enough. Since $\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{T} \geq \xi | \mathbf{Z} > \alpha) \leq 1$, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{T} \geq \xi) \leq \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} > \alpha). \tag{62}$$

We have by Lemma 4 that α is greater than the mode $m_\#$ of $\mathbf{Z}$, thus using Equation (62) one obtains

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{T} \geq \xi) \leq \sum_{m=\lceil\alpha\rceil}^{n} \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} = m) \leq \sum_{m=\lfloor\alpha\rfloor}^{n} \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} = \lfloor\alpha\rfloor),$$

hence,

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{T} \geq \xi) \leq n\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} = \lfloor\alpha\rfloor). \tag{63}$$

We note that Lemma 3 implies

$$\begin{aligned}n\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} = \lfloor\alpha\rfloor) &= \lambda\frac{n^{2/3}}{\log^3 n}\exp\left(-\frac{\lambda}{2n}\frac{n^{4/3}}{\log^6 n} + O\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\frac{n^2}{\log^9 n}\right) + o(1)\right) \\ &= \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda n^{1/3}}{2\log^6 n} + \log\lambda + \frac{2}{3}\log n - \log\log^3 n + o(1)\right),\end{aligned}$$

hence, for sufficiently large n,

$$n\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} = \lfloor \alpha \rfloor) < \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda n^{1/3}}{3\log^6 n}\right). \tag{64}$$

The bound for $\mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{N})$ follows at once from Equations (59), (63) and (64).

We note that, for any positive integer s, Equation (59) implies

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{N} \leq s) = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq s} \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{N} = j) \leq \sum_{1 \leq j \leq s} \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{T} \geq \xi)\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{T} < \xi)^{j-1},$$

so $\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{N} \leq s) \leq s\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{T} \geq \xi)$. In particular, if $s = \exp\left(\frac{\lambda n^{1/3}}{4\log^6 n}\right)$, then Equations (63) and (64) imply

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}\left(\mathbf{N} \leq \exp\left(\frac{\lambda n^{1/3}}{4\log^6 n}\right)\right) \leq \exp\left(\left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{3}\right)\frac{\lambda n^{1/3}}{\log^6 n}\right) = \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda n^{1/3}}{12\log^6 n}\right),$$

as desired. □

We prove now an analogous result for the parameter $\mathbf{B}$. Let $\widetilde{\xi} = \left(\mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{B})\right)^b$ where $b = b(n)$. We prove, as a particular case of Theorem 10, that if $b = \log^{-1} n$ then the expected number of random mappings f sampled before encountering one such that $\mathbf{B}(f) \geq \widetilde{\xi}$ is exponentially large. As before, we consider a sequence $\vec{S} = f_1, f_2, f_3, \ldots$ of $\{0,k\}$-mappings on n nodes chosen independently and uniformly at random. We estimate the asymptotic behavior of the random variable $\widetilde{\mathbf{N}} = \min\{t : \mathbf{B}(f_t) \geq \widetilde{\xi}\}$. We use an argument analogous to the one in the proof of Theorem 9. However, instead of splitting the probability space according to the number of cyclic points in the samples, we consider the parameter $\mathbf{C}(f)$ defined by the number of cycles of a mapping f. We note that $\mathbf{C}(f)$ is equivalent to the number of connected components of f.

Lemma 14. *Let f be a $\{0,k\}$-mapping on $n = kr$ nodes and let $\widetilde{\alpha} = \frac{n^{1/3}}{\log^3 n}$. If $b^{-1}\log^{-2} n = o(1)$ then, for sufficiently large n, $\mathbf{C}(f) < \widetilde{\alpha}$ implies $\mathbf{B}(f) < \widetilde{\xi}$.*

Proof. Let f be a $\{0,k\}$-mapping on $n = kr$ nodes. If $\mathbf{Z}(f) = m$, then $\mathbf{B}$ is the product of $\mathbf{C}$ positive numbers whose sum is m. Hence $\mathbf{B} \leq (m/\mathbf{C})^{\mathbf{C}} \leq (n/\mathbf{C})^{\mathbf{C}}$. The function $C \mapsto (n/C)^C$ is increasing for $C \leq \widetilde{\alpha}$. Therefore, when $\mathbf{C} < \widetilde{\alpha}$, we have for all sufficiently large n that

$$\mathbf{B} < (n/\widetilde{\alpha})^{\widetilde{\alpha}} = \exp\left(\widetilde{\alpha}\log(n/\widetilde{\alpha})\right). \tag{65}$$

It follows from Theorem 3 and the definition of $\widetilde{\xi}$ and $\widetilde{\alpha}$ that

$$\frac{\widetilde{\alpha}\log(n/\widetilde{\alpha})}{\log\widetilde{\xi}} = O\left(\frac{n^{1/3}}{\log^3 n}\log\left(\frac{n^{1/3}}{\log^3 n}\right)b^{-1}n^{-1/3}\right) = O\left(b^{-1}\log^{-2} n\right).$$

If $b^{-1}\log^{-2} n = o(1)$ then, for sufficiently large n, we have $\exp\left(\widetilde{\alpha}\log(n/\widetilde{\alpha})\right) < \widetilde{\xi}$. The result follows from Equation (65). □

Theorem 10. *If $b^{-1}\log^{-2} n = o(1)$ then there exist positive constants c_1, c_2 such that, for sufficiently large n,*

$$\mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\widetilde{\mathbf{N}}) > \exp\left(c_1\frac{(n/\lambda)^{1/3}}{\log^3(n/\lambda)}\right),$$

and, in addition,

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}\left(\widetilde{\mathbf{N}} \leq \exp\left(c_2\frac{(n/\lambda)^{1/3}}{\log^3(n/\lambda)}\right)\right) \leq \exp\left(-c_2\frac{(n/\lambda)^{1/3}}{\log^3(n/\lambda)}\right),$$

Proof. The random variable $\widetilde{\mathbf{N}}$ has a geometric distribution, hence

$$\mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\widetilde{\mathbf{N}}) = \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{B} \geq \widetilde{\xi})}, \tag{66}$$

where, by the Law of Total Probability,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{B} \geq \widetilde{\xi}) =& \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{B} \geq \widetilde{\xi} | \mathbf{C} \geq \widetilde{\alpha}) \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{C} \geq \widetilde{\alpha}) + \\ & \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{B} \geq \widetilde{\xi} | \mathbf{C} < \widetilde{\alpha}) \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{C} < \widetilde{\alpha}).\end{aligned}$$

As a consequence of Lemma 14 we have $\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{B} \geq \widetilde{\xi} | \mathbf{C} < \widetilde{\alpha}) = 0$, so $\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{B} \geq \widetilde{\xi} | \mathbf{C} \geq \widetilde{\alpha}) \leq 1$ implies

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{B} \geq \widetilde{\xi}) \leq \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{C} \geq \widetilde{\alpha}). \tag{67}$$

Using again the Law of Total Probability one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{C} \geq \widetilde{\alpha}) &= \sum_m \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{C} \geq \widetilde{\alpha} | \mathbf{Z} = m) \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} = m) \\ &= \sum_m \mathbf{Q}_m(\mathbf{C} \geq \widetilde{\alpha}) \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} = m).\end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

Using moment generating functions [13] one is able to prove that there exist constants $\rho > 1$ and $c_0 > 0$ such that $\mathbf{Q}_m(\mathbf{C} \geq \widetilde{\alpha}) \leq c_0 \rho^{-\widetilde{\alpha}}$ for all $1 \leq m \leq n$. Thus Equations (67) and (68) imply

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{B} \geq \widetilde{\xi}) \leq c_0 \rho^{-\widetilde{\alpha}} \sum_{m=1}^{n} \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{Z} = m) \leq c_0 \rho^{-\widetilde{\alpha}}.$$

It follows from Equation (66) that

$$\mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\widetilde{\mathbf{N}}) \geq \exp\left(-\log c_0 + \frac{(n/\lambda)^{1/3}}{\log^3(n/\lambda)} \log \rho \right) \geq \exp\left(c_1 \frac{(n/\lambda)^{1/3}}{\log^3(n/\lambda)} \right), \tag{69}$$

for $c_1 = (\log \rho)/2$ and sufficiently large n.

We conclude the proof with an argument analogous to the one in the proof of Theorem 9. For any positive integer s we have

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\widetilde{\mathbf{N}} \leq s) = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq s} \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\widetilde{\mathbf{N}} = j) \leq \sum_{1 \leq j \leq s} \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{B} \geq \widetilde{\xi}) \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{B} < \widetilde{\xi})^{j-1},$$

so $\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\widetilde{\mathbf{N}} \leq s) \leq s \mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{B} \geq \widetilde{\xi})$. It follows from Equations (66) and (69) that, for $s = \exp\left(c_2 \frac{(n/\lambda)^{1/3}}{\log^3(n/\lambda)} \right)$ and $c_2 = c_1/2$,

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{\{0,k\}}\left(\widetilde{\mathbf{N}} \leq \exp\left(c_2 \frac{(n/\lambda)^{1/3}}{\log^3(n/\lambda)} \right) \right) \leq \exp\left((c_2 - c_1) \frac{(n/\lambda)^{1/3}}{\log^3(n/\lambda)} \right),$$

where $c_2 - c_1 = -c_2$. □

6.2 Numerical Results

We exhibit in Table 1 our numerical results on the behavior of $\mathbf{T}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ over different classes of polynomials over finite fields and different classes of mappings. For each value of k, we consider the first 100 primes greater than 10^3 of the form indicated in Table 1. For each such prime, we select, according to Algorithm 1, p mappings on $n = p - 1$ nodes; we also consider all p polynomials of the form indicated in Table 1. We compute the exact value of $\mathbf{T}$ for each function and compute the corresponding average values $\overline{\mathbf{T}}(p)$. We compute the ratio $R_{\mathbf{T}}(p)$ between $\log \overline{\mathbf{T}}(p)$ and the quantity in Theorem 2. In Table 1

Class of functions	Asymptotic Coalescence	$\overline{R_{\mathbf{T}}}(\lambda)$	$\overline{R_{\mathbf{B}}}(\lambda)$
Unrestricted mappings	1	0.8090	0.7247
$\{0,2\}$-mappings	1	0.7929	0.7097
$x^2 + a \in \mathbb{F}_p[x]$	1	0.8031	2.4183
$x^4 + a \in \mathbb{F}_p[x]$, $p \equiv 3 \pmod 4$	1	0.8033	3.9237
$\{0,3\}$-mappings	2	0.7700	0.7043
$x^3 + a \in \mathbb{F}_p[x]$, $p \equiv 1 \pmod 3$	2	0.7631	2.5067
$\{0,4\}$-mappings	3	0.7436	0.7007
$x^4 + a \in \mathbb{F}_p[x]$, $p \equiv 1 \pmod 4$	3	0.7391	2.6055
$\{0,5\}$-mappings	4	0.7465	0.7041
$x^5 + a \in \mathbb{F}_p[x]$, $p \equiv 1 \pmod 5$	4	0.7435	3.3597
$\{0,6\}$-mappings	5	0.6986	0.6789
$x^6 + a \in \mathbb{F}_p[x]$, $p \equiv 1 \pmod 6$	5	0.6989	1.3522

Table 1: Experimental results on mappings and polynomials according to their coalescence.

we exhibit the average value $\overline{R_{\mathbf{T}}}$ of $R_{\mathbf{T}}(p)$ over all primes considered; we stress the dependence of this calculation on the coalescence λ of the corresponding class by adopting the notation $\overline{R_{\mathbf{T}}}(\lambda)$. The same is done for the parameter $\mathbf{B}$.

It is not surprising to have the ratio $\overline{R_{\mathbf{T}}}$ distant from 1 even in the case of $\{0,k\}$-mappings, where we have an asymptotic result proved on the logarithm of the expectation of $\mathbf{T}$. It is proved in Theorem 9 that most of the contribution to $\mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{T})$ comes from a relatively small set of exceptional maps. Unless the number of samples is enormous, as stated in the first part of the theorem, none of these exceptional maps is likely to be sampled, so our empirical estimate for $\mathbb{E}_n^{\{0,k\}}(\mathbf{T})$ is likely to be poor. The ratios $\overline{R_{\mathbf{T}}}$ appear to decrease as λ grows large, but this agrees, in a way, with the fact that the upper bound in Theorem 9 decreases as k grows large.

Regardless of the sampling problem explained in Section 6.1, it is remarkable that the ratio between any two entries in the table above for $\overline{R_{\mathbf{T}}}$ with the same value of λ lies in the interval $(0.97, 1.03)$. This suggests that the behavior of a typical $\{0,k\}$-polynomial can be approximated by the behavior of a typical $\{0,k\}$-mapping. However, one must be careful when using the asymptotic estimate in Theorem 2 as a reference, due to the results in Theorem 9. The numerical results for the parameter $\mathbf{B}$, on the other hand, represent a different scenario, where the ratio between numerical results for classes with the same value of asymptotic coalescence were found to be as high as 4.8835. It is not clear why the heuristic performs so poorly in the approximation of the statistics of polynomials by mappings in the case of the parameter $\mathbf{B}$.

References

[1] Abramowitz, M., and Stegun, I. A. *Handbook of mathematical functions.* Dover, New York, 1965.

[2] Arney, J., and Bender, E. Random mappings with constraints on coalescence and number of origins. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics 103*, 2 (1982), 269–294.

[3] Arratia, R., Barbour, A., and Tavaré, S. Limits of logarithmic combinatorial structures. *Annals of probability 28*, 4 (2000), 1620–1644.

[4] Arratia, R., Barbour, A. D., and Tavaré, S. *Logarithmic combinatorial structures: a probabilistic approach.* European Mathematical Society, Zurich, 2003.

[5] Arratia, R., and Tavaré, S. Limit theorems for combinatorial structures via discrete process approximations. *Random Structures & Algorithms 3*, 3 (1992), 321–345.

[6] Barbour, A. D., and Tavaré, S. A rate for the erdös-turán law. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing 3*, 2 (1994), 167–176.

[7] Brent, R. P., and Pollard, J. M. Factorization of the eighth fermat number. *Mathematics of Computation 36*, 154 (1981), 627–630.

[8] Burnette, C., and Schmutz, E. Periods of iterated rational functions over a finite field. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.04193* (2015). To appear in the November Issue of the International Journal of Number Theory

[9] Drmota, M., and Soria, M. Images and preimages in random mappings. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics 10*, 2 (1997), 246–269.

[10] Erdös, P., and Turán, P. On some problems of a statistical group-theory. iii. *Acta Mathematica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae 18*, 3-4 (1967), 309–320.

[11] Flajolet, P., and Odlyzko, A. M. Random mapping statistics. In *Advances in cryptology - EUROCRYPT '89* (New York, 1990), vol. 434 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, pp. 329–354.

[12] Flajolet, P., and Sedgewick, R. *Analytic combinatorics*. Cambridge University press, Cambirdge, 2009.

[13] Flajolet, P., and Soria, M. General combinatorial schemas: Gaussian limit distributions and exponential tails. *Discrete Mathematics 114*, 1-3 (1993), 159–180.

[14] Greene, D. H., and Knuth, D. E. *Mathematics for the Analysis of Algorithms*. Springer, New York, 2007.

[15] Harris, B. The asymptotic distribution of the order of elements in symmetric semigroups. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A 15*, 1 (1973), 66–74.

[16] Kolchin, V. F. *Random mappings. Translated from the Russian. Translation Series in Mathematics and Engineering*. Optimization Software, Inc., Publications Division, New York, 1986.

[17] Landau, E. *Handbuch der Lehre von der Verteilung der Primzahlen*. Teubner, Berlin, 1909.

[18] Martins, R. S. V., and Panario, D. On the heuristic of approximating polynomials over finite fields by random mappings. To appear in the November Issue of the International Journal of Number Theory, 2015.

[19] Pollard, J. M. A monte carlo method for factorization. *BIT Numerical Mathematics 15*, 3 (1975), 331–334.

[20] Rohatgi, V. K., and Saleh, A. M. E. *An introduction to probability and statistics*, vol. 910. John Wiley & Sons, New York, 2011.

[21] Rubin, H., and Sitgreaves, R. Probability distributions related to random transformations of a finite set. Tech. Rep. SOL ONR 19A, Stanford, 1954.

[22] Schmutz, E. Period lengths for iterated functions. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing 20*, 2 (2011), 289–298.

[23] Szalay, M. On the maximal order in s_n and $s * _n$. *Acta Arithmetica 37*, 1 (1980), 321–331.

[24] Wiener, M. J., and Zuccherato, R. J. Faster attacks on elliptic curve cryptosystems. In *Selected areas in Cryptography* (New York, 1999), vol. 1556 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, pp. 190–200.